

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/679,576	10/06/2003	Jaakko Lehikoinen	872.0157.U1(US)	3118	
29683	7590 12/19/2005		EXAMINER		
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP			NGUYEN, DUC M		
4 RESEARCH DRIVE SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2685		
			DATE MAIL ED. 12/10/2004	DATE MAIL ED: 12/19/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/679,576	LEHIKOINEN ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Duc M. Nguyen	2685		
The MAILING Period for Reply	DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STAN WHICHEVER IS LO - Extensions of time may be after SIX (6) MONTHS froo - If NO period for reply is so - Failure to reply within the sandreply received by the	NGER, FROM THE MAILING DA e available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 in the mailing date of this communication. decified above, the maximum statutory period we set or extended period for reply will, by statute,	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE date of this communication, even if timely filed	I. lety filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)⊠ This action is (3)□ Since this app	lication is in condition for allowan	eptember 2005. action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45			
Disposition of Claims					
4a) Of the abor 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-9,1</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s)	1-25 and 27-38 is/are rejected.	vn from consideration.			
Application Papers					
10) The drawing(s) Applicant may r Replacement drawing(s)	not request that any objection to the crawing sheet(s) including the correcti	r. epted or b) □ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See fon is required if the drawing(s) is objection.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C	C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)					
	Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:			

Art Unit: 2685

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to applicant's response filed on 9/29/05. Claims 1-9, 11-25, 27-38 are now pending in the present application. **This action is made final**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC ∋ 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims **1-9, 11-25, 27-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Sheha** (US 2005/0073443) in view of **Csaszar** (US **2003/0233422**).

Regarding claim **1, Sheha** discloses a method for storing, referencing, retrieving, and graphically displaying spatial (location information) and non-spatial (activity or the use of mobile terminal) related information of a mobile terminal (see Abstract and the entire reference) which would include all the claimed limitations, comprising:

a memory storing application software and data that is descriptive of the use of the mobile terminal (see [0101], [0105], [0119]);

a display (see [0101], [0105], [0119]); and

a controller, coupled to the memory and responsive to the application software and to at least a sub-set of the stored data, for visualizing on the display, in a graphical

Art Unit: 2685

form, the use of the mobile station over a period of time (see Fig. 6, 10 and [0101], [0105], [0119]);

a controller, coupled to the memory and responsive to the application software and to at least a sub-set of the stored data, for deriving content information (i.e, location history or Meta data according to common thread) and transfer it to an online server (see [0081], [0082], [0083] and [0140]).

Here, although **Sheha** discloses the Meta information is shared with a group of other users through a web server (see [0029], [0032], [0082], [0086], [0087]), **Sheha** fails to disclose a web log for publishing such Meta information. However, using a web log for sharing personal information is known in the art as disclosed by **Csaszar** (see Abstract, Fig. 7 and [0163]). Since **Sheha** discloses the mobile terminal information is shared with a group of users and published on the Internet, and since using a web log for sharing personal information is well known in the art as disclosed by **Csaszar**, and since Sheha and Csaszar **both** teach a method of sharing personal information in the Internet via web servers, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the web log teaching of Csaszar to Sheha for publishing mobile terminal information in the form of a "blog" as well, thereby providing a controller as claimed, for utilizing advantages of the popular web log application (i.e, it is widely used and viewed by many users around the world).

Regarding claim **2**, **Sheha** further discloses the controller constructs a temporally-based visualization of the use of the mobile station (see [0119]).

Art Unit: 2685

Regarding claim **3, Sheha** further discloses the controller constructs a chronological visualization of the use of the mobile station (see Figs. 6, 10).

Regarding claim **4, Sheha** further discloses the temporally-based visualization incorporates scheduled events (see [0119]).

Regarding claim **5, Sheha** further discloses the temporally-based visualization incorporates mobile terminal location information (see Fig. 6).

Regarding claim **6**, **Sheha** further discloses the temporally-based visualization incorporates mobile terminal sensor data information (see [008]).

Regarding claim **7**, since **Sheha** also discloses a cellular phone, it is clear that the temporally-based visualization would obviously incorporate at least one of telephone calls that are made from and made to the mobile terminal as well, in order for the mobile to keep track of whom the mobile has contacted during a period of time.

Regarding claim **8, Sheha** further discloses the temporally-based visualization incorporates at least one of messages that are sent from and sent to the mobile terminal (see [0119])

Regarding claim **9, Sheha** further discloses the temporally-based visualization incorporates an indication of images that are captured by the mobile terminal (see [0008], [0105] and [0119]).

Regarding claim **14, Sheha** further discloses a user input as claimed (see [0105]).

Regarding claims **11-13**, **15**, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Sheha** as modified would disclose the step of

Art Unit: 2685

automatically deriving a content or subset (i.e, location history) from user-selected data stored in the memory (see [0140]).

Regarding claims **16**, **18**, **Sheha** further discloses the derived information is presented graphically and textually as claimed (see Figs. 6, 10).

Regarding claim 17, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 15 above. In addition, since the non-spatial information includes voice recording, it would have been obvious that the recording would provide auditory means as claimed in order to present the recorded voice when retrieving by the user of the mobile terminal.

Regarding claims **19-21, 24-25**, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 2-4, 8-9 above, respectively.

Regarding claim 23, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 7 above.

Regarding claim **30**, **Sheha** further discloses a user input as claimed (see [0105]).

Regarding claims **27-29**, **31**, **34**, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 15 above.

Regarding claims **32**, **35**, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, since **Csasza** discloses pictures or illustrations (see Fig. 7) for the blog, and since using animation pictures for web pages or blogs is well known in the art in order to make the appearance of a web page look active to a viewer, one skilled in the art of computer would recognize the benefit of such animation for these

Art Unit: 2685

pictures to further modify Csasza and **Sheha** for providing animations as claimed, for entertainment purpose.

Regarding claims **33**, **36**, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Sheha** as modified would disclose textual information generated automatically by the blog as claimed (see Csaszar, [0163]).

3. Claims 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Sheha (US 2005/0073443) in view of Ogawa et al (US 6,529,218).

Regarding claim **37**, **Sheha** discloses a method for storing, referencing, retrieving, and graphically displaying spatial (location information) and non-spatial (activity or the use of mobile terminal) related information of a mobile terminal (see Abstract and the entire reference) which would include all the claimed limitations, comprising:

a memory storing application software and data that is descriptive of the use of the mobile terminal (see [0101], [0105], [0119]);

a display (see [0101], [0105], [0119]); and

a controller, coupled to the memory and responsive to the application software and to at least a sub-set of the stored data, for visualizing on the display, in a graphical form, the use of the mobile station over a period of time (see Fig. 6, 10 and [0101], [0105], [0119]);

Here, although **Sheha** fails disclose a scroll, it is noted that utilizing such a scroll for a device with a small display is well known in the art as disclosed by **Ogawa** (see

Art Unit: 2685

Figs. 5-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the above teaching of Ogawa to Sheha for providing scroll buttons to the mobile device in Sheha as well, thereby providing a scroll that would scroll along a timeline of list-based textual information as claimed, for providing the mobile terminal the capability of displaying a large amount of data.

Regarding claim **38**, it is clear that if a large amount of events occurred in a timeline, **Sheha** as modified would disclose only a portion of the timeline is visible in the display.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 9/29/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to claims 1-9, 11-25, 27-36 regarding a web log (blog), it is noted that Applicant fails to provide reasons why the combination of Sheha and Csaszar does not make obvious claims 1-9, 11-25, 27-36. Therefore, the Examiner assumed that Applicant has contended in the 4th paragraph of page 8 of the response that the combination of Sheha and Csaszar is improper (i.e, there is no suggestion to combine the references).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2685

the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, since mobile terminal activity information is one of personal information, and since **Sheha** does teach that the mobile terminal information is shared with a group of users and published on the Internet (see [0029], [0032], [0082], [0086], [0087], [140]), and since using an Internet "web log" for sharing personal information is known in the art as disclosed by Csaszar (see Abstract, Fig. 7 and [0163]), it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the benefit of web log to incorporate the web log teaching of Csaszar to Sheha for publishing mobile terminal information in the form of a web log format as well, thereby providing a controller that would derive Meta data from mobile information according to a common thread (see Sheha, [0140]), transfer these data into "blog" objects (Csaszar's teaching) for publishing these Meta data in a Web page (see Sheha, [0082]), for utilizing advantages of the popular web log application (i.e., it is widely used and viewed by many users around the world).

Here, since Sheha and Csaszar both teach a method of sharing personal information in the Internet via web servers, the combination is proper.

As to claims 15-30 regarding the "automatically" feature, it is noted that the specification fails to disclose in specific details how this "automatically" feature be done automatically (i.e, the specification only describes the input and output data). Therefore, with a broadest reasonable interpretation, this "automatically" feature is interpreted in the similar way as done in Figs. 3-4 or in Fig. 7 of Csaszar (i.e, derivative objects,

Art Unit: 2685

pictures and/or messages were "automatically" created/processed by computer software or processors). Therefore, Csaszar would obviously teach such "automatically" feature.

As to claims 32, 35 regarding the "animation" feature, it is noted that using animation pictures for web pages or web logs is well known in the art, in order to make the appearance of a web page look active to a viewer, for entertainment purpose. Since **Csasza** discloses pictures for web logs, one skilled in the art would recognize that such pictures would obviously be, or modified to be, animation pictures according to subject matter of the corresponding message (i.e., see Csasza, Fig. 7 regarding the picture of a cat in the "Adopt a cat" message), in order to make the blog message look active to a viewer, for entertainment purpose.

For foregoing reason, the examiner believes that the pending claims are not allowable over the cited prior art.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2685

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Harper et al (US 2004/0015562) discloses a web logging method for mobile devices.

Wang et al (US 2003/035412) discloses an animated audio message.

7. Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box A.F.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for **formal** communications intended for entry)

(571)-273-7893 (for informal or draft communications).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Customer Service Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Application/Control Number: 10/679,576 Page 11

Art Unit: 2685

Any inquiry concerning this communication or communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7893, Monday-Thursday (9:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

Or to Edward Urban (Supervisor) whose telephone number is (571) 272-7899.

Duc M. Nguyen, P.E.(

Dec 8, 2005